UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,343	10/511,343 04/11/2005 Jacques Mallet		BJS-3665-122	3751
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 09/29/200 NDERHYE. PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	SAJJADI, FEREYDOUN GHOTB		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1633		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/511,343	MALLET ET AL.	
Fugueline i	A (11 '4	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	FEREYDOUN G. SAJJADI	1633						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (a) 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 (Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 cension and the corresponding amount of chortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing dat	36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate nally set in the final Office	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water MAMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100					
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amandmant (DTOL 224\					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpilant Amendment (i	-10L-324).					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	·	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 35,36,43-49,51-53 and 58-71. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e:	xplanation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/Fereydoun G Sajjadi/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1633						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants have amended base claim 35 to include the limitation of neuronal cells, altering claim scope and necessitating the rejection of the claim over a new combination of prior art references previously made of record..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 35, 36, 43-49, 51-53, 58-63 and 66-71 under 35 USC §103(a) over the various combination of Barry et al. (Hum. Gene Ther. 12:1103-1108; 2001), Paulding et al. (J. Biol. Chem. 274:2532-2538), Ramezani et al. (Mol. Ther. 2:458-469; 2000), Rogers et al. (J. Biol. Chem. 274:6421-6431; 1999, Aronov et al. (J. Mol. Nerurosci., 12:131-145; 1999) and Chang et al. (Curt. Gene Ther. 2:237-251; 2001), as set forth in the Final Office action dated June 16, 2009, for reasons of record.

Applicants' Affadavit under Rule §1.132, containing evidence of synergy and unexpected results has not been entered, because Applicants have not provided a good and sufficient showing why the evidence was not earlier provided.

Applicants' arguments are based on the proposed amended claims, and the Rule §1.132 Declaration. However, as the Declaration has not been entered, the arguments are not found to be persuasive.